



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,910	03/08/2001	Mitsuru Higuchi	OGA-181-USAP	5533
28892	7590	09/27/2004		
SNIDER & ASSOCIATES P. O. BOX 27613 WASHINGTON, DC 20038-7613			EXAMINER NATNAEL, PAULOS M	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/800,910

Applicant(s)

HIGUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Paulos M. Natnael

Art Unit

2614

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. **ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see response to argument below.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 3-5.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
MICHAEL H. LEE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Applicant's arguments filed 2 July 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

#### Applicant's Arguments

- a) Although this rejection is final, this is Applicant's first opportunity to discuss the rejection and the newly cited Dischert '931 reference.
- b) Claim 1 calls for controlling of the frame signal and the frame memory such that horizontal line data of the frame signal can be read twice at the double speed of a write speed of the frame signal. There is nothing like this found in or suggested by the combination of references.
- c) Kawai '490 does not suggest or teach the timing of the read and write control circuits found in the last paragraph of applicant's claim 1. Namely, the reading of the field memory at double speed, the temporary writing of the signal in a frame memory, and reading of horizontal line data of the frame signal at a double speed of the write speed of the frame memory M3.
- d) Claim 4...Here it is stated that the data is read at  $n(n>3)$  times as fast as the write signal. There is nothing in any of the references which would suggest this fast readout of the entire field memory to achieve the multiple lines.

#### Examiner's Response

- a) the first final rejection was withdrawn and another final rejection was made in its place; final because Applicants Amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection, according to the rules.
- b) Kawai discloses that "a scanning line converting means for storing a first field signal and a second field signal of an input interlaced scanning signal, alternately reading out the stored first and second field signals on each scanning line and thereby generating a progressive scanning signal of the same frame frequency as the input interlaced scanning signal". (col. 13, 9-16) [emphasis added] Kawai further teaches that "In the scanning line converting circuit 15, the first and second fields of this signal are memorized respectively in the FIFO memories 17 and 18, and, are alternately read out in a line period by the switch 19 and thereby, as shown in FIG. 4(b), the input signal is converted to a video signal of a progressive scanning system of a frame frequency of 30 Hz and is output." (col. 8, lines 55-66) This indicates the Kawai's write/read control (not shown) system. And the signal is now progressive scanning system of frame type not field type. That means, no longer can it be stored (temporarily or not) in field memory – it can only be handled as a frame (s) at a frame frequency of 30 Hz, as Kawai discloses. Kawai et al also teaches that ... as shown in FIG. 4(c), a progressive scanning system video signal (of a scanning line number of 525 lines) of a frame frequency of 60 Hz will be output from the switch 33. The write/read circuit and reading the horizontal line twice is, nonetheless, notoriously well known in the art. Dischert discloses television display with doubled horizontal lines wherein "each incoming horizontal line of video information is stored in a memory and read twice at a double clock frequency." (see abstract) Dischert teaches read control means and write control means which is connected to controllable delay means D1-D4 (fig.3a). The arrangement of Fig.3 illustrates a time-compressor adapted for producing two identical lines for each input line. (col. 4, lines 39-41) Hence, the combination of Kawai and Dischert teaches a method of controlling the video signal output as a progressive scanning signal and then storing the video information in a frame memory (because it may no longer be stored in a field memory) and reading the signal twice at double clock frequency as Dischert clearly teaches. Argument therefore is not persuasive.
- c) Applicant cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where, as here the rejections are based on combination of two references. See response in Part b above.
- d) Kawai or Dischert may not specifically disclose reading the data  $n>3$  times as fast as the write signal; however, it would be obvious to those with ordinary skill in the art to recognize the teaching of the prior art which shows it is well known to read video signal at a double speed or at three times or four times of the write signal and modify the system of Kawai and Dischert to that effect.